

REMARKS

Claims 1-12, 16-18 and 20-23 are now presented for examination, of which Claims 1, 8, 9, 16, 18 and 23 are independent claims. Claims 1, 8, 9 and 16-18 have been amended to define still more clearly what Applicant regards as his invention. Claim 19 has been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer of subject matter, and Claim 23 has been added. The dependency of Claim 22 has been amended to reflect cancellation of Claim 19. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Initially, Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for conducting an interview with one of his attorneys. Based on that interview, Applicant has as shown above sought further to clarify the feature that the converting step (or unit) does not convert the corrected input color image signal when it is determined in the determining step (or unit) that the corrected input color image signal does not represent achromatic color.

In this regard, it should be noted that the black generating section 84 in *Kouzaki* executes the black generation process even in a case where the input color is not achromatic color. Applicant submits that it is apparent from this that nothing in *Kouzaki* would teach or suggest the converting step (or unit) as now recited in the respective independent claims.

Further, Applicant notes the point raised by the Examiner that the UCR/BP control ROM 96 in *Kouzaki* could be deemed to correspond to the correcting step (or unit) of Applicant's claims. Applicant notes that the UCR/BP control ROM 96 controls the processing condition of the black generating section 84 on the basis of the judged result of the achromatic/chromatic color judging section 95. That is, the UCR/BP control ROM 96 does not process an input color image signal. Thus, Applicant believes that the process of

the UCR/BP control ROM 96 in *Kouzaki* is quite different from the process of the correcting step (or unit) in the independent claims.

For at least these reasons, Applicant submits that the independent claims are allowable over *Kouzaki*.

A review of the other art of record has failed to reveal anything which, in Applicant's opinion, would remedy the deficiencies of the art discussed above, as a reference against the independent claims herein. Those claims are therefore believed patentable over the art of record.

The other claims in this application are each dependent from one or another of the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York Office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Leonard P Diana/

Leonard P. Diana
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 29,296

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

NY_MAIN 587046v1